



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICISMS AND DISCUSSIONS.

PANLOGISM.

A reply to Dr. Carus's reply (October number of *The Monist*) would involve a very lengthy paper. The issues raised open up a controversy of very extensive scope: in fact practically all the questions differently answered by the "monistic positivism" of my kindly and accomplished critic and by my own Neo-Leibnitzian monadism. And in view of the space occupied by me in the last *Monist*, I lack the effrontery to pen the long essay required.

Let me say here that all the issues are treated—some at considerable length—in my *Riddle of the Universe* (Arnold: London and New York). Those, however, who desire a succinct statement of the *ground-principles* of my system, may be referred to the essay in the July number of the *Free Review* (London: Swan, Sonnenschein) entitled "The New Monadism." Pending the publication of my developed system, I have nothing to add to the arguments there advanced. Let me observe in passing that no one who reads this essay will echo Dr. Carus's opinion that my monads are "substances which, for the sake of ridding them of gross materiality, have been reduced to atomic size." Size is a space-attribute, and space, in my view, only a form of perception *and ideation* of a monad. The monad or self (Kant's "transcendental subject") is not in space, but contrariwise space is in it. I have dealt in the *Riddle* with this issue at length and cannot understand how one who reads it can fail to follow my meaning.

I must just glance in passing at Dr. Carus's theory of Immortality. Jesus is immortal because his words are immortal. "The words of Jesus are his soul." "Christ lives where the word of Christ is received and where it becomes the motive of conduct." This is a *Comtean* immortality only. Jesus or John Smith is not destined to enjoy or suffer a perpetuity of *conscious* life: they only pass on ideas or "thought-forms." Let me point out some considerations bearing on this doctrine:

1. The immortality is verbal. Indeed, it is not even this. The slow freezing of the planet, nay, even the perishing of certain human stocks, would terminate it! Jesus would no longer persist, were there no terrestrial beings to repeat his words or act on his teachings.

2. It cannot be said that the "thought-forms" would even persist *as long as* men lived to receive them. And why? Because no two people can "think" exactly the same thoughts; *there are as many Christianities as there are persons*, and the name Christianity stands not for any definite persisting standpoint, but for a myriad-faced, *always changing process*. The "thought-forms" of Jesus, Dr. Carus, a bishop, and a tramp (all "Christians") are so many different psychological phenomena; and labelling certain vaguely-resembling portions of these phenomena as "Christianity," does not at all hide their vast differences. Jesus on Comtean lines does not persist at all—he has merely *started* an ethico-psychological process which is always changing its shape. Ideas ABOUT Jesus's ideas are not the ideas of Jesus!

3. The "immortality" is of no ethical value. Men who do not believe that *they* persist after physical death will not—taking communities into view—uselessly vex themselves with painful self-culture or "progress." They will degenerate; (a consideration, however, of no relevance where the *proofs* of persistence are being discussed).

There is much else to be said against this Comtean view of immortality, but the above considerations will for the present suffice. E. DOUGLAS FAWCETT.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

I should have preferred to publish Mr. Fawcett's comments on my reply to his "Panlogism" without further remarks, were it not that his explanations of my view of immortality might then seem to be acknowledged by me as being correctly stated. Therefore, I wish to add a few words which shall set the reader right, at least as to the main point of the subject.

Mr. Fawcett, who regards my view of immortality as Comtean, still insists on making a difference between a man's self and his soul-forms. He grants to some extent the immortality of the latter, but he thinks that the repudiation of a self-soul as a separate entity renders it illusory. Mr. Fawcett forgets to tell us what a soul would be without its peculiar ideas, sentiments, and aspirations. He assumes the existence of two things, (1) a soul in and for itself, a monad, and (2) the life and deeds of a man. Thus Jesus would be (1) a Jesus-monad and (2) his life consisting of his preachings and the moral example he set for mankind.

According to the immortality which I proclaim, Jesus is not a self in itself which preached certain theories, but his life, consisting of his preachings and his actions, was he himself. Jesus did not have the logos, but he was the logos, the logos being the truths which appeared in him; and this logos according to the Christian doctrines of the Fourth Gospel is an eternal, omnipresent reality in the constitution of the world. The logos was before Jesus was born and continued to exist after his death. It was at the beginning and will remain forever and aye even though this earth of ours break to pieces.

Mr. Fawcett would be clearer about the true nature of the self if he only proposed to himself the question, "What am I?" "What is Jesus?" "What is Mr. Smith?" He will find upon a proper analysis that every man consists of the memories of all deeds done in his own life as well as in the lives of his ancestors. He is the product of a long process of evolution, and as he is the continuation of the past, so in the future he will be the continuation of the present. Every organ-